arXiv:1403.1916v1 [math.CO] 8 Mar 2014

On Zero-free Intervals of Flow Polynomials*

F.M. Dong†
Mathematics and Mathematics Education
National Institute of Education
Nanyang Technological University, Singapore 637616

Abstract

This article studies real roots of the flow polynomial $F(G,\lambda)$ of a bridgeless graph G. For any integer $k \geq 0$, let ξ_k be the supremum in $(1,2]$ such that $F(G,\lambda)$ has no real roots in $(1,\xi_k)$ for all graphs G with $|W(G)| \leq k$, where $W(G)$ is the set of vertices in G of degrees larger than 3. We prove that ξ_k can be determined by considering a finite set of graphs and show that $\xi_k = 2$ for $k \leq 2$, $\xi_3 = 1.430\cdots$, $\xi_4 = 1.361\cdots$ and $\xi_5 = 1.317\cdots$. We also prove that for any bridgeless graph $G = (V,E)$, if all roots of $F(G,\lambda)$ are real but some of these roots are not in the set $\{1,2,3\}$, then $|E| \geq |V| + 17$ and $F(G,\lambda)$ has at least 9 real roots in $(1,2)$.

Keywords: graph, chromatic polynomial, flow polynomial, root

1 Introduction

The graphs considered in this paper are undirected and finite, and may have loops and parallel edges. However, the graphs should have no loops when their chromatic polynomials are considered, and the graphs should have no bridges when their flow polynomials are considered. For any graph G, let $V(G), E(G), P(G,\lambda)$ and $F(G,\lambda)$ be the set of vertices, the set of edges, the chromatic polynomial and the flow polynomial of G. The roots of $P(G,\lambda)$ and $F(G,\lambda)$ are called *the chromatic roots* and *the flow roots* of G respectively.

A *near-triangulation* is a loopless connected plane graph in which at most one face is not bounded by a cycle of order 3. Birkhoff and Lewis [1] showed that G has no real

*Partially supported by NIE AcRf funding (RI 2/12 DFM) of Singapore.
†Corresponding author. Email: fengming.dong@nie.edu.sg.

chromatic roots in $(1,2)$ for every near-triangulation G. Since $P(G,\lambda) = \lambda F(G^*,\lambda)$ for any plane graph G, where G^* is its dual, this result is equivalent to that any connected plane graph G has no flow roots in $(1,2)$ under the condition $|W(G)| \leq 1$, where $W(G)$ is the set of vertices x in G with its degree[1] larger than 3.

Jackson [4] generalized Birkhoff and Lewis' result by showing that any bridgeless connected graph G with $|W(G)| \leq 1$ has no real flow roots in $(1,2)$, no matter whether G is planar or non-planar.

One of the purposes of this paper is to find maximal zero-free intervals in $(1,2)$ for the flow polynomials of some families of graphs and hence extend Jackson's result mentioned above. For any integer $k \geq 0$, let Ψ_k be the set of bridgeless connected graphs with $|W(G)| \leq k$ and ξ_k be the supremum in $(1,2]$ such that every graph G in Ψ_k has no flow roots in $(1,\xi_k)$. So $\xi_0, \xi_1, \xi_2, \cdots$ is a non-increasing sequence. In Section 4, we will show that ξ_k can be determined by considering a finite set of graphs in $\Psi_k \setminus \Psi_{k-1}$ and finds that $\xi_k = 2$ for $k \leq 2$, $\xi_3 = 1.430\cdots$, $\xi_4 = 1.361\cdots$ and $\xi_5 = 1.317\cdots$.

By definition, the flow polynomial $F(G,\lambda)$ is 0 if G contains a bridge (e.g., see (2.1)). A graph $G = (V,E)$ is said to be *non-separable* if G is connected with no cut-vertex[2] and either it has no loops or $|E| = |V| = 1$.

By the definition, a graph with one vertex and at most one edge is non-separable, and a non-separable graph has a bridge if and only if this graph is K_2. A graph is called *separable* if it is not non-separable. A *block* of G is a maximal subgraph of G with the property that it is non-separable. By Lemma 2.1, if a graph G is separable, then $F(G,\lambda)$ is the product of $F(B,\lambda)$ over all blocks B of G. By Lemmas 2.2 and 2.4, for a non-separable graph G, if either $G-e$ [3] is separable for some edge e in G or G has a proper 3-edge-cut[4], then $(\lambda-1)F(G,\lambda)$ or $(\lambda-1)(\lambda-2)F(G,\lambda)$ is equal to the product of the flow polynomials of two graphs with less edges. Note that if G has a 2-edge-cut, then $G-e$ is separable for each e in this cut. Thus, when we consider the locations of flow roots, we need only to study those non-separable graphs which contain no proper 3-edge-cut nor an edge e with $G-e$ to be separable.

Another purpose of this paper is to study the existence of bridgeless graphs which have real flow roots only but have some flow roots not in the set $\{1,2,3\}$. If such

[1]The degree of x in G, denoted by $d_G(x)$ (or simply $d(x)$), is defined to be the sum of the number of non-loop edges in G incident with x and twice the number of loops in G incident with x.

[2]A vertex x in G is called a *cut-vertex* if $G-x$ has more components that G has.

[3]$G-e$ is the subgraph of G obtained from G by deleting e.

[4]A 3-edge-cut E' of G is said to be *proper* if the deletion of all edges in E' produces more non-empty components than G has. Thus, if G is non-separable, then a 3-edge-cut of G is proper if and only if this 3-edge-cut is not formed by three edges incident with a common vertex of degree 3.

graphs do exist, then some of them are non-separable graphs which have neither 2-edge-cut nor proper 3-edge-cut. In Section 5, we show that if a non-separable graph $G = (V, E)$ is such a graph and contains neither 2-edge-cut nor proper 3-edge-cut, then G will satisfy various conditions (see Theorem 5.1), including that $|W(G)| \geq 3$, $|E(G)| \geq |V(G)| + 8|W(G)| - 7$ and G has at least $\frac{22}{27}(2|W(G)| - 1)$ real roots in $(1, 2)$. In the end of this paper, we pose a conjecture that that for any bridgeless graph G, if all flow roots of G are real, then every flow root of G is in the set $\{1, 2, 3\}$.

2 Some fundamental results on flow polynomials

The *flow polynomial* $F(G, \lambda)$ of a graph G can be obtained from the following properties of $F(G, \lambda)$ (see Tutte [10]):

$$F(G,\lambda) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } E = \emptyset; \\ 0, & \text{if } G \text{ has a bridge}; \\ F(G_1,\lambda)F(G_2,\lambda), & \text{if } G = G_1 \cup G_2; \\ (\lambda-1)F(G-e,\lambda), & \text{if } e \text{ is a loop}; \\ F(G/e,\lambda) - F(G-e,\lambda), & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases} \tag{2.1}$$

where G/e [5] is the graphs obtained from G by contracting e respectively, and $G_1 \cup G_2$ is the disjoint union of graphs G_1 and G_2.

By definition, a loop in G is considered as a block, and any block with more than one vertex has no loops nor cut-vertices. Let $b(G)$ be the number of non-trivial blocks (i.e., those blocks which are not K_1) of G. Thus $b(G) = 0$ if and only if $E(G) = \emptyset$, and if G is connected with $E(G) \neq \emptyset$, then $b(G) = 1$ if and only if G is non-separable.

For a connected graph $G = (V, E)$ without loops, it is well known (see Woodall [9]) that $(-1)^{|V|}P(G, \lambda) > 0$ for all real $\lambda < 0$ and $(-1)^{|V|-1}P(G, \lambda) > 0$ for all real $0 < \lambda < 1$. Woodall [9] and Whitehead and Zhao [8] independently showed that G always has a chromatic root of multiplicity $b(G)$ at $\lambda = 1$. Jackson [2] also proved that $(-1)^{|V|-b(G)+1}P(G, \lambda) > 0$ for all real $1 < \lambda \leq 32/27$, where the result does not hold if $32/27$ is replaced by any larger number. For flow polynomials, there is an analogous result due to Wakelin [7].

Theorem 2.1 ([7]) *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a bridgeless connected graph. Then*

(a) $F(G, \lambda)$ is non-zero with sign $(-1)^{|E|-|V|+1}$ for $\lambda \in (-\infty, 1)$;

[5] If u and v are two vertices of a graph H, let H/uv denote the graph obtained from H by identifying u and v. So every edge of H is also an edge in H/uv and every edge of H joining u and v becomes a loop in H/uv. Then G/e is the graph $(G - e)/uv$, where u and v are the two ends of e.

(b) $F(G,\lambda)$ *has a zero of multiplicity* $b(G)$ *at* $\lambda = 1$*;*

(c) $F(G,\lambda)$ *is non-zero with sign* $(-1)^{|E|-|V|+b(G)-1}$ *for* $\lambda \in (1, 32/27]$. □

In this paper, the properties of factorization of flow polynomials will be applied repeatedly. By the result in (2.1), the following result can be easily proved by induction.

Lemma 2.1 *Let* G *be a bridgeless graph. If* $G_1, G_2, \cdots, G_k$ *are the blocks of* G*, then*

$$F(G,\lambda) = \prod_{1\le i\le k} F(G_i,\lambda). \tag{2.2}$$

The next three results on the factorization of flow polynomials can be found in [4] (see [3, 5] also). For any graph G and any two vertices u and v in G, let $G+uv$ denote the graph obtained by adding a new edge joining u and v.

Lemma 2.2 ([4]) *Let* G *be a bridgeless connected graph,* v *be a vertex of* G*,* $e = u_1u_2$ *be an edge of* G*, and* H_1 *and* H_2 *be edge-disjoint subgraphs of* G *such that* $E(H_1)\cup E(H_2) = E(G-e)$*,* $V(H_1)\cap V(H_2) = \{v\}$*,* $V(H_1)\cup V(H_2) = V(G)$*,* $u_1 \in V(H_1)$ *and* $u_2 \in V(H_2)$*, as shown in Figure 1. Then*

$$F(G,\lambda) = \frac{F(G_1,\lambda)F(G_2,\lambda)}{\lambda-1}. \tag{2.3}$$

where $G_i = H_i + vu_i$ *for* $i \in \{1,2\}$.



Figure 1: $G-e$ is separable.

Lemma 2.3 ([4]) *Let* G *be a bridgeless connected graph,* S *be a 2-edge-cut of* G*, and* H_1 *and* H_2 *be the sides of* S*, as shown in Figure 2. Let* G_i *be obtained from* G *by contracting* $E(H_{3-i})$*, for* $i \in \{1,2\}$*. Then*

$$F(G,\lambda) = \frac{F(G_1,\lambda)F(G_2,\lambda)}{\lambda-1}. \tag{2.4}$$



G G_1 when H_2 is connected

Figure 2: G has a 2-edge-cut.

Lemma 2.4 ([4]) *Let G be a bridgeless connected graph, S be a 3-edge-cut of G, and H_1 and H_2 be the sides of S. Let G_i be obtained from G by contracting $E(H_{3-i})$, for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Then*

$$F(G, \lambda) = \frac{F(G_1, \lambda)F(G_2, \lambda)}{(\lambda - 1)(\lambda - 2)}. \tag{2.5}$$

Remark: For a non-separable graph G, if G contains a 2-edge-cut, then $G - e$ is separable for each e in this cut and thus Lemma 2.3 is a special case of Lemma 2.2. Also note that the graph in Lemma 2.4 has a structure similar to the one in Figure 2.

We end this section with the following result which will be applied many times in this paper.

Lemma 2.5 *Let G be a non-separable graph with subgraphs G_1 and G_2 such that $V(G_1) \cap V(G_2) = \{u, v\}$, $V(G_1) \cup V(G_2) = V(G)$, $E(G_1) \cap E(G_2) = \emptyset$ and $E(G_1) \cup E(G_2) = E(G)$, as shown in Figure 3(a). Then*

$$F(G, \lambda) = \frac{F(G_1 + uv, \lambda)F(G_2 + uv, \lambda)}{\lambda - 1} + F(G_1, \lambda)F(G_2, \lambda), \tag{2.6}$$

where u and v be two vertives of G.

Proof. Let H be the graph obtained G by replacing v by two new vertices v_1 and v_2 and for all edges in G_i incident with v, changing their common end v to v_i, as shown in Figure 3(b). Thus H/v_1v_2 is the graph G. By (2.1), we have

$$F(G, \lambda) = F(H, \lambda) + F(H + v_1v_2, \lambda). \tag{2.7}$$

By Lemma 2.1,

$$F(H, \lambda) = F(G_1, \lambda)F(G_2, \lambda) \tag{2.8}$$

and by Lemma 2.2,

$$F(H + v_1v_2, \lambda) = \frac{F(G_1 + uv, \lambda)F(G_2 + uv, \lambda)}{\lambda - 1}. \tag{2.9}$$

Thus the result holds. □



(a) Graph G (b) Graph H (c) Graph $H + v_1v_2$

Figure 3: G is formed by proper subgraphs G_1 and G_2, and $H/v_1v_2 = G$

3 A theorem on a zero-free interval

In this section, we shall provide a sufficient condition for determining a zero-free interval $(1, \beta)$ of $F(G, \lambda)$, where $\beta \in (1, 2)$, for all graphs G in a family $\mathcal{S}$. We shall first obtain a sufficient condition for a real number λ in $(1, 2)$ such that $F(G, \lambda) \neq 0$ for all graphs G in $\mathcal{S}$. In proving this result, we use some techniques that have appeared in [2] where Jackson proved that every chromatic polynomial has no real roots in $(1, 32/27]$. For any connected graph G, let

$$Q(G, \lambda) = (-1)^{p(G)} F(G, \lambda) \tag{3.1}$$

where $p(G) = |E(G)| - |V(G)| + b(G) - 1$. So $p(G) = |E(G)| - |V(G)|$ if G is non-separable with $E(G) \neq \emptyset$. Theorem 2.1 implies that $Q(G, \lambda) > 0$ for any bridgeless connected graph G and real number $\lambda \in (1, 32/27]$. It is also clear that $F(G, \lambda) \neq 0$ if and only if $Q(G, \lambda) \neq 0$.

Lemma 3.1 *Let $\mathcal{S}$ be a family of bridgeless connected graphs and λ be any real number in $(1, 2)$. Assume that $\mathcal{S}$ contains a subfamily $\mathcal{S}'$ of non-separable graphs such that conditions (i)-(iii) below are satisfied:*

(i) *$Q(G, \lambda) > 0$ for all graphs $G \in \mathcal{S}'$;*

(ii) *for every separable graph $G \in \mathcal{S}$, all blocks of G belong to $\mathcal{S}$;*

(iii) *for every non-separable graph $G \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}'$, one of the following cases occurs:*

  (a) for some edge e in G, $G - e$ has a cut-vertex u and each G_i belongs to $\mathcal{S}$ for $i = 1, 2$, where G_1 and G_2 are graphs stated in Lemma 2.2;

  (b) for some edge e in G, both $G - e$ and G/e belong to $\mathcal{S}$ and both $b(G - e)$ and $b(G/e)$ are odd numbers;

(c) *there are subgraphs G_1 and G_2 of G with $V(G_1)\cap V(G_2)=\{u_1,u_2\}$, $V(G_1)\cup V(G_2)=V(G)$, $E(G_1)\cap E(G_2)=\emptyset$ and $E(G_1)\cup E(G_2)=E(G)$, as shown in Figure 3(a), such that $b(G_1)+b(G_2)$ is even, and for $i=1,2$, $|E(G_i)|\geq 2$ and both $G_i+u_1u_2$ and G_i belong to $\mathcal{S}$, where $G_i+u_1u_2$ is the graph obtained from G_i by adding a new edge joining u_1 and u_2; and*

(d) *there are subgraphs G_1 and G_2 of G with $|E(G_1)|\geq 3$, $|E(G_2)|\geq 2$, $V(G_1)\cap V(G_2)=\{u_1,u_2\}$, $V(G_1)\cup V(G_2)=V(G)$, $E(G_1)\cap E(G_2)=\emptyset$ and $E(G_1)\cup E(G_2)=E(G)$, as shown in Figure 3(a), such that $b(G_1/u_1u_2)+b(G_2)$ is an odd number and $G_1+u_1u_2$, G_1/u_1u_2, G_2, $G_2+u_1u_2$ and $G_2+2u_1u_2$ all belong to $\mathcal{S}$, where $G_2+2u_1u_2$ is the graph obtained from G_2 by adding two parallel edges joining u_1 and u_2.*

Then $Q(G,\lambda)>0$ for all graphs $G\in\mathcal{S}$.

Proof. Suppose the result does not hold. Then there exists $G\in\mathcal{S}$ such that $Q(G,\lambda)\leq 0$ but $Q(H,\lambda)>0$ for all $H\in\mathcal{S}$ with $|E(H)|<m$, where $m=|E(G)|$. Now let G be fixed. By Condition (i), either G is separable or $G\in\mathcal{S}\setminus\mathcal{S}'$. We shall complete the proof by proving the following claims.

Claim 1: G is non-separable.

Suppose that G is separable with blocks $G_1,G_2,\cdots,G_k$, where $k=b(G)\geq 2$. For all $i=1,2,\cdots,k$, since $|E(G_i)|<m$ and $G_i\in\mathcal{S}$ by Condition (ii), we have $Q(G_i,\lambda)>0$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} p(G) &= |E(G)|-|V(G)|+k-1 \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{k}|E(G_i)|-\left(-(k-1)+\sum_{i=1}^{k}|V(G_i)|\right)+k-1 \\ &= 2(k-1)+\sum_{i=1}^{k}p(G_i). \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 2.1,

$$F(G,\lambda)=\prod_{i=1}^{k}F(G_i,\lambda). \tag{3.2}$$

Thus

$$Q(G,\lambda)=(-1)^{p(G)}F(G,\lambda)=\prod_{i=1}^{k}(-1)^{p(G_i)}F(G_i,\lambda)=\prod_{i=1}^{k}Q(G_i,\lambda)>0, \tag{3.3}$$

a contradiction. Hence Claim 1 holds.

Claim 2: Condition (a) of (iii) is not satisfied.

Suppose that G contains an edge e such that $G-e$ has a cut-vertex u and $G_i \in \mathcal{S}$ for $i=1,2$, where G_1 and G_2 are graphs stated in Lemma 2.2. As $|E(G_i)| < m$, we have $Q(G_i,\lambda) > 0$ for $i=1,2$. By Lemma 2.2,

$$F(G,\lambda) = \frac{F(G_1,\lambda)F(G_2,\lambda)}{\lambda-1}. \tag{3.4}$$

Since G is non-separable by Claim 1, both G_1 and G_2 are non-separable. Thus

$$p(G_1)+p(G_2) = |E(G_1)|-|V(G_1)|+|E(G_2)|-|V(G_2)| = (|E(G)|+1)-(|V(G)|+1) = p(G),$$

implying that

$$Q(G,\lambda) = \frac{Q(G_1,\lambda)Q(G_2,\lambda)}{\lambda-1} > 0, \tag{3.5}$$

a contradiction. Hence Claim 2 holds.

Claim 3: Condition (b) of (iii) is not satisfied.

Suppose that G contains an edge e such that both $b(G/e)$ and $b(G-e)$ is odd and both G/e and $G-e$ belong to $\mathcal{S}$.

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} p(G/e) &= |E(G/e)| - |V(G/e)| + b(G/e) - 1 \\ &= |E(G)| - 1 - (|V(G)|-1) + b(G/e) - 1 = p(G) + b(G/e) - 1 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} p(G-e) &= |E(G-e)| - |V(G-e)| + b(G-e) - 1 \\ &= |E(G)| - 1 - |V(G)| + b(G-e) - 1 = p(G) + b(G-e) - 2. \end{aligned}$$

As G is non-separable, e is not a loop. By (2.1), we have

$$F(G,\lambda) = F(G/e,\lambda) - F(G-e,\lambda).$$

Since both $b(G/e)$ and $b(G-e)$ are odd, we have

$$Q(G,\lambda) = Q(G/e,\lambda) + Q(G-e,\lambda).$$

Since both G/e and $G-e$ belong to $\mathcal{S}$ and both have less edges than G, by the assumption on G, we have $Q(G/e,\lambda) > 0$ and $Q(G-e,\lambda) > 0$. Thus $Q(G,\lambda) > 0$, a contradiction. Hence Claim 3 holds.

Claim 4: Condition (c) of (iii) is not satisfied.

Suppose that condition (c) of (iii) is satisfied. Let G_1 and G_2 be such subgraphs of G stated in condition (c). By Lemma 2.5,

$$F(G,\lambda) = \frac{1}{\lambda-1}F(G_1+u_1u_2,\lambda)F(G_2+u_1u_2,\lambda) + F(G_1,\lambda)F(G_2,\lambda). \tag{3.6}$$

As $G_i + u_1u_2$ is non-separable for $i = 1, 2$, we have

$$p(G_1+u_1u_2)+p(G_2+u_1u_2) = |E(G_1)|+1-|V(G_1)|+|E(G_2)|+1-|V(G_2)| = m-|V| = p(G). \tag{3.7}$$

We also have

$$\begin{aligned} p(G_1)+p(G_2) &= |E(G_1)|-|V(G_1)|+b(G_1)-1+|E(G_2)|-|V(G_2)|+b(G_2)-1 \\ &= m-|V|-4+b(G_1)+b(G_2) = p(G)-4+b(G_1)+b(G_2). \end{aligned}$$

Since $b(G_1)+b(G_2)$ is even,

$$Q(G,\lambda) = \frac{1}{\lambda-1}Q(G_1+u_1u_2,\lambda)Q(G_2+u_1u_2,\lambda) + Q(G_1,\lambda)Q(G_2,\lambda). \tag{3.8}$$

As $|E(G_i)| \leq m-2$, by the assumption G, $Q(G_1+u_1u_2,\lambda)$, $Q(G_2+u_1u_2,\lambda)$, $Q(G_1,\lambda)$ and $Q(G_2,\lambda)$ are all positive, and so $Q(G,\lambda) > 0$, a contradiction.

Claim 5: Condition (d) of (iii) is not satisfied.

Suppose that condition (d) of (iii) is satisfied. Assume that G_1 and G_2 are two subgraphs of G as stated in condition (d), as shown in Figure 3(a). By Lemma 2.5,

$$\begin{aligned} & F(G,\lambda) \\ = \ & \frac{1}{\lambda-1}F(G_1+u_1u_2,\lambda)F(G_2+u_1u_2,\lambda) + F(G_1,\lambda)F(G_2,\lambda) \\ = \ & \frac{1}{\lambda-1}F(G_1+u_1u_2,\lambda)F(G_2+u_1u_2,\lambda) + [F(G_1/u_1u_2,\lambda)-F(G_1+u_1u_2,\lambda)]F(G_2,\lambda) \\ = \ & F(G_1/u_1u_2,\lambda)F(G_2,\lambda) + \frac{F(G_1+u_1u_2,\lambda)}{\lambda-1}\left[F(G_2+u_1u_2,\lambda)-(\lambda-1)F(G_2,\lambda)\right], \end{aligned}$$

and also by Lemma 2.5, we have

$$F(G_2+2u_1u_2,\lambda) = (\lambda-2)F(G_2+u_1u_2,\lambda) + (\lambda-1)F(G_2,\lambda). \tag{3.9}$$

Thus

$$F(G,\lambda) = F(G_1/u_1u_2,\lambda)F(G_2,\lambda)+F(G_1+u_1u_2,\lambda)\left[F(G_2+u_1u_2,\lambda) - \frac{F(G_2+2u_1u_2,\lambda)}{\lambda-1}\right]. \tag{3.10}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} & p(G_1/u_1u_2)+p(G_2) \\ = \ & |E(G_1)|-(|V(G_1)|-1)+b(G_1/u_1u_2)-1+|E(G_2)|-|V(G_2)|+b(G_2)-1 \\ = \ & |E(G)|-|V(G)|-3+b(G_1/u_1u_2)+b(G_2) \\ = \ & p(G)-3+b(G_1/u_1u_2)+b(G_2). \end{aligned}$$

As $b(G_1/u_1u_2)+b(G_2)$ is an odd number, $p(G_1/u_1u_2)+p(G_2)$ and $p(G)$ have the same parity (i.e., the sum of them is even). It can also be checked similarly that $p(G_1+u_1u_2)+p(G_2+u_1u_2)$ and $p(G)$ have the same parity, but $p(G_1+u_1u_2)+p(G_2+2u_1u_2)$ and $p(G)$ have different parity. Thus

$$Q(G,\lambda)=Q(G_1/u_1u_2,\lambda)Q(G_2,\lambda)+Q(G_1+u_1u_2,\lambda)\left[Q(G_2+u_1u_2,\lambda)+\frac{Q(G_2+2u_1u_2,\lambda)}{\lambda-1}\right]. \tag{3.11}$$

By the given conditions and the assumption on G, $Q(G_1/u_1u_2,\lambda)$, $Q(G_1+u_1u_2,\lambda)$, and $Q(G_2,\lambda)$, $Q(G_2+u_1u_2,\lambda)$ and $Q(G_2+2u_1u_2,\lambda)$ are all positive. Hence $Q(G,\lambda)>0$, a contradiction.

Hence Claim 5 holds. By the above claims, we know that G is non-separable and does not satisfy condition (iii), contradicting the the given conditions. Thus the result holds. □

By Lemma 3.1, the following result is immediately obtained.

Theorem 3.1 *Let $\mathcal{S}$ be a family of bridgeless connected graphs and β a real number in $(1,2]$. Assume that there exists $\mathcal{S}'\subseteq\mathcal{S}$ such that condition (i) in Lemma 3.1 holds for all $\lambda\in(1,\beta)$ and both conditions (ii) and (iii) in Lemma 3.1 hold, then $Q(G,\lambda)>0$ for all graphs $G\in\mathcal{S}$ and all real $\lambda\in(1,\beta)$.* □

4 How to determine ξ_k

Recall that Ψ_k is the set of bridgeless connected graphs G with $|W(G)|\leq k$ and ξ_k is the supremum in $(1,2]$ such that every graph in Ψ_k has no flow roots in $(1,\xi_k)$. In this section, we will show that ξ_k can be determined by considering the set of graphs in Θ with exactly k vertices, where Θ is the set of graphs defined by the two steps below:

(i) $Z_3\in\Theta$, where Z_j is the graph with two vertices and j parallel edges joining these two vertices; and

(ii) $G(e)\in\Theta$ for every $G\in\Theta$ and every $e\in E(G)$, where $G(e)$ is the graph obtained from $G-e$ by adding a new vertex w and adding two parallel edges joining w and u_i for both $i=1,2$, as shown in Figure 4.

As examples, we also determine the values of ξ_k for $k\leq 5$: $\xi_k=2$ for $k=0,1,2$, $\xi_3=1.430159709\cdots$, $\xi_4=1.361103081\cdots$ and $\xi_5=1.317672196\cdots$, where the last three numbers in $(1,2)$ are the real zeros of $\lambda^3-5\lambda^2+10\lambda-7$, $\lambda^3-4\lambda^2+8\lambda-6$ and $\lambda^3-6\lambda^2+13\lambda-9$ in $(1,2)$ respectively.



Figure 4: Graphs G and $G(e)$

For any bridgeless graph G, let $\eta(G)$ be the minimum flow root of G in the interval $(1, 2]$ if such root exists and $\eta(G) = 2$ otherwise. By Theorem 2.1, we have $32/27 < \eta(G) \leq 2$ for every bridgeless graph G. For any set $\mathcal{S}$ of bridgeless graphs, let

$$\eta(\mathcal{S}) = \begin{cases} \inf\{\eta(G) : G \in \mathcal{S}\}, & \text{if } \mathcal{S} \neq \emptyset; \\ 2, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{4.1}$$

Thus $\xi_k = \eta(\Psi_k)$ and $\xi_0, \xi_1, \xi_2, \cdots$ is a non-increasing sequence.

Let Φ be the set of non-separable graphs G with $|V(G)| \geq 2$ such that the following conditions are all satisfied:

(a') $G - e$ is non-separable for each edge e in G;

(b') $b(G/e)$ is even for each edge e in G; and

(c') if G_1 and G_2 are subgraphs of G such that $|E(G_i)| \geq 2$ for $i = 1, 2$, $V(G_1) \cap V(G_2) = \{u_1, u_2\}$, $V(G_1) \cup V(G_2) = V(G)$, $E(G_1) \cap E(G_2) = \emptyset$ and $E(G_1) \cup E(G_2) = E(G)$, as shown in Figure 3(a), then the three integers $b(G_1/u_1u_2), b(G_1) - 1$ and $b(G_2)$ all have the same parity.

Instead we prove directly that ξ_k can be determined by considering the set of graphs in Θ with exactly k vertices, we will obtain this conclusion by proving that Θ is actually equal to the set Φ and $\xi_k = \eta(\Phi_k)$, where Φ_k is the set of graphs $G \in \Phi$ with $|V(G)| = k$.

We will first show that $\xi_k = \min\{\eta(\Phi_i) : 2 \leq i \leq k\}$ and the following result will be applied in proving it. For a graph $G = (V, E)$ and $x \in V$, let $N(x) = \{u : xu \in E(G)\}$. So $d(x) \geq |N(x)|$, where equality holds if and only if G has no loops or parallel edges incident with x.

Lemma 4.1 *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a non-separable graph with $|V| \geq 3$ and $x \in V$ with $d(x) \leq 3$. If $G - e$ is non-separable for every edge e incident with x, then G/e' is also non-separable for every edge e' incident with x.*

Proof. Suppose that G/e' is separable for some edge e' incident with x.

Suppose that $|N(x)| \leq 2$. Since $|V| \geq 3$ and G is non-separable, $|N(x)| = 2$. As $d(x) \leq 3$ and $|N(x)| = 2$, there is a single edge incident with x, and observe that $G - e$ is separable for such an edge e, a contradiction. Thus $|N(x)| = 3$, implying that $d(x) = 3$ and no parallel edges are incident with x.

Since G/e' is separable and $d(x) = |N(x)| = 3$, $G - e$ must be separable for every edge e which is different from e' and is incident with x, a contradiction. □

Lemma 4.2 *For $k \geq 2$, $\xi_k = \min\{\eta(\Phi_i) : i = 2, 3, \cdots, k\}$.*

Proof. We prove this result by applying Theorem 3.1. Let $\mathcal{S} = \Psi_k$ and

$$\mathcal{S}' = \{L, Z_2\} \cup \bigcup_{2 \leq i \leq k} \Phi_i, \tag{4.2}$$

where L is the graph with one vertex and one loop. Let $\beta = \min\{\eta(\Phi_i) : i = 2, 3, \cdots, k\}$.

By the definition on β, we have $Q(G, \lambda) > 0$ for all $G \in \mathcal{S}'$ and all $\lambda \in (1, \beta)$. Thus condition (i) of Lemma 3.1 is satisfied for all $\lambda \in (1, \beta)$.

Observe that for any $G \in \mathcal{S}$ $(= \Psi_k)$, if G is separable, then $|W(B)| \leq |W(G)| \leq k$ for each block B of G and so each block of G belongs to $\mathcal{S}$. Hence Condition (ii) of Lemma 3.1 is also satisfied.

If Condition (iii) of Lemma 3.1 holds for every non-separable graph $G \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}'$, then this result holds by Theorem 3.1. Now suppose that Condition (iii) of Lemma 3.1 does not hold for some non-separable graph $G \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}'$. So none of conditions (a), (b), (c) and (d) of (iii) in Lemma 3.1 is satisfied for G. We shall show that $W(G) = V(G)$ and G satisfies conditions (a'), (b') and (c') in page 11, and thus $G \in \Phi$, implying that $G \in \mathcal{S}'$, a contradiction.

If G does not satisfy condition (a'), then for some edge e in G, $G - e$ has a cut-vertex u for some edge e. Then $W(G_i) \subseteq W(G)$ and so $G_i \in \Psi_k$ for $i = 1, 2$, where G_1 and G_2 are the two graphs stated in Lemma 2.2. Thus condition (a) is satisfied, a contradiction. Hence G satisfies condition (a').

Before we can show that G satisfies conditions (b') and (c'), we need to show that $W(G) = V(G)$. Suppose that $W(G) \neq V(G)$. Let $x \in V(G) \setminus W(G)$ and $u \in N(x)$. If $W(G) \neq \emptyset$, x and u are selected so that $u \in W(G)$. It is clear that $|V(G)| \geq 3$; otherwise, $d(x) \leq 3$ implies that $G = Z_2$ or Z_3 and so $G \in \mathcal{S}'$, a contradiction. As G satisfies condition (a'), $G - e$ is non-separable for every edge e incident with x,

and so Lemma 4.1 implies that G/xu is non-separable. As $W(G-xu) \subseteq W(G)$, $G-xu \in \Psi_k$. If $W(G)=\emptyset$, then $G/xu \in \Psi_1 \subseteq \Psi_k$; if $W(G) \neq \emptyset$, then $u \in W(G)$ and so $|W(G/xu)| = |W(G)|$, implying that $G/xu \in \Psi_k$. Thus condition (b) of (iii) in Lemma 3.1 is satisfied, a contradiction. Hence $W(G) = V(G)$.

Since $W(G) = V(G)$, we have $|V(G)| \leq k$ and thus any bridgeless connected minor of G belongs to Ψ_k. Since G does not satisfy condition (b) of (iii) in Lemma 3.1, it immediately follows that G satisfies condition (b') in page 11.

We now show that G also satisfies condition (c') in page 11. Suppose that this is not true. Then G has subgraphs G_1 and G_2 such that $|E(G_i)| \geq 2$ for $i = 1, 2$, $V(G_1) \cap V(G_2) = \{u_1, u_2\}$, $V(G_1) \cup V(G_2) = V(G)$, $E(G_1) \cap E(G_2) = \emptyset$ $E(G_1) \cup E(G_2) = E(G)$, as shown in Figure 3(a), but the three integers $b(G_1/u_1u_2), b(G_1) - 1$ and $b(G_2)$ don't have the same parity. Note that both G_i and $G_i + u_1u_2$ belong to Ψ_k for $i = 1, 2$. Since G does not satisfies condition (c) of (iii) in Lemma 3.1, $b(G_1)+b(G_2)$ is an odd number, i.e., $b(G_1) - 1$ and $b(G_2)$ have the same parity. Thus $b(G_2)$ and $b(G_1/u_1u_2)$ don't have the same parity, i.e., $b(G_2) + b(G_1/u_1u_2)$ is odd. Note that $G_1 + u_1u_2$, G_1/u_1u_2, G_2, $G_2 + u_1u_2$ and $G_2 + 2u_1u_2$ all belong to $\mathcal{S}$. Since G does not satisfies condition (c) of (iii), we have $|E(G_1)| < 3$. Thus $|E(G_1)| = 2$. Since deleting any edge from G does not produce a separable graph, the only two edges in G_1 are parallel edges joining u_1 and u_2. Thus $b(G_1/u_1u_2) = 2$ and $b(G_1) = 1$, implying that $b(G_1/u_1u_2)$ and $b(G_1) - 1$ have the same parity and hence $b(G_1/u_1u_2), b(G_1) - 1$ and $b(G_2)$ all have the same parity, a contradiction.

Hence G satisfies condition (c'). Then, by definition of Φ, $G \in \Phi$, implying that $G \in \Phi_i$, where $i = |V(G)| \leq k$. Thus $G \in \mathcal{S}'$, contradicting the assumption on G. □

Later we will show that $\eta(\Phi_0), \eta(\Phi_1), \eta(\Phi_2), \eta(\Phi_3), \cdots$ is a non-increasing sequence and so Lemma 4.2 implies that $\xi_k = \eta(\Phi_k)$ for $k \geq 2$.

Now we are going to show that Θ and Φ are actually the same set. To prove this result, we need to apply some properties on graphs in Θ and Φ.

Lemma 4.3 *Let $G = (V, E) \in \Phi$. Then for any distinct vertices u_1, u_2 in G, $b(G/u_1u_2) \in \{1, 3\}$.*

Proof. The result is true when $|V| = 2$. Assume that $|V| \geq 3$ and $b(G/u_1u_2) \geq 2$. So there are subgraphs G_1 and G_2 such that $V(G_1) \cap V(G_2) = \{u_1, u_2\}$, $V(G_1) \cup V(G_2) = V(G)$, $E(G_1) \cap E(G_2) = \emptyset$ and $E(G_1) \cup E(G_2) = E(G)$, as shown in Figure 3(a). If $b(G/u_1u_2) \geq 4$, then G_1 and G_2 can be non-separable, then $|E(G_i)| \geq 2$ and $b(G_1) = b(G_2) = 1$, contradicting condition (c') that $b(G_1) - 1$ and $b(G_2)$ have the same parity. Now assume that $b(G/u_1u_2) = 2$. So G_i/u_1u_2 is non-separable for $i = 1, 2$. By condition

(b'), we have $|E(G_i)| \geq 2$ for $i = 1, 2$. Thus, by condition (c'), $b(G_1) + b(G_2)$ is an odd number at least 3. Then $b(G_1)$ or $b(G_2)$ is even. Assume that $b(G_2)$ is even. Then $b(G_1/u_1u_2)$ must be even by condition (c'), contradicting the fact that G_1/u_1u_2 is non-separable. □

Lemma 4.4 *Let $G = (V, E) \in \Phi$. Assume that G_1 and G_2 are proper subgraphs of G such that $V(G_1) \cap V(G_2) = \{u_1, u_2\}$, $V(G_1) \cup V(G_2) = V(G)$, $E(G_1) \cap E(G_2) = \emptyset$ and $E(G_1) \cup E(G_2) = E(G)$, as shown in Figure 3(a). If $|E(G_2)| \geq 2$ and G_2 is non-separable, then $G_2 + u_1u_2 \in \Phi$.*

Proof. Assume that $|E(G_2)| \geq 2$ and G_2 is non-separable. If $|E(G_1)| = 1$, then $G_1 + u_1u_2$ is G and so the result holds.

Now assume that $|E(G_1)| \geq 2$. Since G satisfies condition (c') and G_2 is non-separable, $b(G_1)$ must be even. Because G satisfies condition (c') again, $b(G_2/u_1u_2)$ and $b(G_1)$ should have the same parity and so $b(G_2/u_1u_2)$ must be even.

Let e' denote an edge joining u_1 and u_2. Thus $G_i + u_1u_2$ can be written as $G_i + e'$. Note that $G_1 + e'$ is non-separable, implying that the following statement is true:

> for any non-separable subgraph H of $G_2 + e'$ (or $(G_2 + e')/v_1v_2$ for any vertices v_1, v_2 in $G_2 + e'$) with $e' \in E(H)$, if $|E(H)| \geq 2$, then the subgraph obtained from H by replacing e' by G_1 with vertex u_i of G_1 being identified with u_i in H for $i = 1, 2$ is also non-separable.

Because G satisfies conditions (a'), (b') and (c') and the above statement holds, to show that $G_2 + e'$ satisfies conditions (a'), (b') and (c'), it suffices to show that it satisfies conditions (a') and (b') for the edge e'.

Observe that deleting e' from $G_2\Delta + e'$ obtains G_2 which is non-separable by the given condition. Also $(G_2+e')/e' = G_2/u_1u_2$ has even blocks. Thus G_2+e' satisfies conditions (a') and (b') for the edge e'. □

By the definition of Θ, Θ has only one graph (i.e., Z_3) with two vertices, one graph with three vertices and one graph with four vertices respectively, as shown in Figure 5.

It can be verified easily that every graph in Θ satisfies conditions (a'), (b') and (c') and thus $\Theta \subseteq \Phi$. To show that $\Phi = \Theta$, we will prove by induction that every graph of Φ also belongs to Θ.

Let $\Gamma(G)$ be the set of vertices x in G such that $d(x) = 4$ and $|N(x)| = 2$. If $G \in \Phi$ and $|V(G)| \geq 3$, Lemma 4.3 implies that there are at most two parallel edges joining

(a) (b)

Figure 5: The only graphs in Θ with 3 or 4 vertices

any two vertices in a graph of Φ. Then for each $x \in \Gamma(G)$ with $N(x) = \{u_1, u_2\}$, there are exactly two parallel edges joining x and u_i for $i = 1, 2$.

Lemma 4.5 *For any $G = (V, E) \in \Theta$, if $|V| \geq 3$, then $\delta(G) = 4$; and if $|V| \geq 4$, then there are two non-adjacent vertices in $\Gamma(G)$.*

Proof. We will prove this result by induction on $|V|$. By definition, the two graphs in Figure 5 are the only graphs in Θ with three and four vertices respectively. Thus the result holds when $|V| \leq 4$.

Let $G = (V, E) \in \Phi$ with $|V| \geq 4$. Assume that the result holds for G. It is clear that $\delta(G(e)) = 4$ by the definition of $G(e)$ and the assumption that $\delta(G) = 4$.

Assume that u_1, u_2 are the two ends of e. As the result holds for G, there exists $w_1 \in \Gamma(G) \setminus \{u_1, u_2\}$. It is clear that $w_1 \in \Gamma(G(e))$. By the definition of $G(e)$, the new vertex w of $G(e)$ is not adjacent to w_1 and also belongs to $\Gamma(G(e))$. Thus the result holds for $G(e)$. □

Now we are going to prove that Φ and Θ are actually the same set.

Theorem 4.1 $\Phi = \Theta$.

Proof. It is easy to verify recursively that every graph in Θ satisfies conditions (a'), (b') and (c') and so $\Theta \subseteq \Phi$.

We will prove by induction on the number of vertices that every graph G of Φ belongs to Θ. If $|V(G)| = 2$, then $G = Z_3$ and so $G \in \Theta$. Assume that every graph of Φ with less than m vertices belongs to Θ, where $m \geq 3$. Now let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph of Φ with $|V| = m$. We first show that $\Gamma(G) \neq \emptyset$.

Assume that u_1 and u_2 are adjacent vertices in G. As G satisfies condition (b'), $b(G/u_1u_2)$ must be odd and so $b(G/u_1u_2) = 3$ by Lemma 4.3. Then G has the structure

shown in Figure 6(a), where G_1 and G_2 are two connected subgraphs of G such that $V(G_1) \cap V(G_2) = \{u_1, u_2\}$, $V(G_1) \cup V(G_2) = V(G)$, $E(G_1) \cap E(G_2) = \emptyset$ and $E(G_1) \cup E(G_2) = E(G) \setminus \{e\}$, where e is an edge of G joining u_1 and u_2.



Figure 6: Graph G

Since $|V| \geq 3$, we may assume that $|V(G_1)| \geq 3$. As $b(G_2 + e) = 1$ and G satisfies condition (c'), $b(G_1)$ is even. Thus G_1 can be divided into two edge-disjoint subgraphs H_1 and H_2 such that $V(H_1) \cap V(H_2) = \{v\}$, $V(H_1) \cup V(H_2) = V(G_1)$, and $E(G_1) \cup E(G_2) = E(G_1)$, as shown in Figure 6(b). By Lemma 4.3, it can be deduced that $b(G_1 + e) + b(G_2) = 3$, implying that both H_1 and H_2 are non-separable. As G satisfies condition (a'), we have $|E(H_i)| \geq 2$.

If $|V| = 3$, then each H_i has exactly two edges and G_2 has just one edge, and so G is the graph $Z_3(e')$ for some edge e' in Z_3, and hence $\Gamma(G) = V(G)$. Now assume that $|V| \geq 4$. At least one of the three subgraphs H_1, H_2 and $G_2 + e$ contains at least three vertices.

Consider the case that $G_2 + e$ has at least three vertices. Lemma 4.4 implies that $G_2 + e + u_1u_2 \in \Phi$. Since this graph has less vertices than G, by inductive assumption, $G_2 + e + u_1u_2 \in \Theta$. Then, by Lemma 4.5, there exists $x \in \Gamma(G_2 + e + u_1u_2) \setminus \{u_1, u_2\}$. It is clear that $x \in \Gamma(G)$.

Now assume that $V(G_2) = \{u_1, u_2\}$. As G/u_1u_2 has exactly 3 blocks by Lemma 4.3, G_2 is the graph Z_1. Then we may assume that $|V(H_1)| \geq 3$. Lemma 4.4 implies that $H_1 + u_1w \in \Phi$. Since $H_1 + u_1w$ has less vertices than G, by inductive assumption, $H_1 + u_1w \in \Theta$. Thus the graph $(H_1 + u_1w)(f) \in \Theta$ by the definition of Θ, where f is an edge of $H_1 + u_1w$ joining u_1 and w. By Lemma 4.5, either $u_1 \in \Gamma((H_1 + u_1w)(f))$ or there is $x \in \Gamma((H_1 + u_1w)(f)) \setminus \{w, u_1\}$. Thus either $u_1 \in \Gamma(G)$ or $x \in \Gamma(G)$.

Hence $\Gamma(G) \neq \emptyset$. Let w be a vertex in $\Gamma(G)$. Let $N(w) = \{v_1, v_2\}$. Then there are exactly two parallel edges joining w and v_i for $i = 1, 2$. Since G satisfies condition (c'),

$G-w$ is non-separable and has at least two edges. By Lemma 4.4, $(G-w)+v_1v_2 \in \Phi$. By inductive assumption, $(G-w)+v_1v_2 \in \Theta$. Hence $G \in \Theta$ by the definition of Θ. □

By Theorem 4.1 and the definition of Θ, we have $\Phi_0 = \Phi_1 = \emptyset$, $\Phi_2 = \{Z_3\}$ and $\Phi_{k+1} = \{G(e) : G \in \Phi_k, e \in E(G)\}$ for $k \geq 2$.

Now it remains to show that $\eta(\Phi_0), \eta(\Phi_1), \eta(\Phi_2), \eta(\Phi_3), \cdots$ is non-increasing and so Lemma 4.2 implies that $\xi_k = \eta(\Phi_k)$.

Theorem 4.2 *$\eta(\Phi_0), \eta(\Phi_1), \eta(\Phi_2), \eta(\Phi_3), \cdots$ is a non-increasing sequence and $\xi_k = \eta(\Phi_k)$ for $k = 0, 1, 2, \cdots$.*

Proof. Since Φ_2 has only one graph, i.e., Z_3, we have $\xi_2 = \eta(\Phi_2) = 2$ by Lemma 4.2. Thus $\xi_i = 2 = \eta(\Phi_i)$ for $i = 0, 1, 2$. We need to apply the following claim.

Claim A: For $k \geq 2$, if $\xi_k = \eta(\Phi_k)$, then $\eta(\Phi_{k+1}) \leq \eta(\Phi_k)$.

Suppose that $\eta(\Phi_k) < \eta(\Phi_{k+1})$. Then there exists $G \in \Phi_k$ such that $\eta(G) = \eta(\Phi_k)$. As $\eta(\Phi_{k+1}) \leq 2$, $\eta(\Phi_k) < 2$, and so $F(G, \eta(\Phi_k)) = 0$.

Let e be an edge of G joining two vertices u_1 and u_2. By Lemma 2.5, we have

$$F(G(e), \lambda) = (\lambda - 1)^2 F(G - e, \lambda) + (\lambda - 2)^2 F(G, \lambda) \tag{4.3}$$

and

$$F(G + u_1u_2, \lambda) = (\lambda - 1)F(G - e, \lambda) + (\lambda - 2)F(G, \lambda). \tag{4.4}$$

Thus

$$F(G(e), \lambda) = (\lambda - 1)F(G + u_1u_2, \lambda) + (2 - \lambda)F(G, \lambda). \tag{4.5}$$

Since $G, G + u_1u_2$ and $G(e)$ are all non-separable, $p(G), p(G(e))$ and $p(G + u_1u_2) - 1$ all have the same parity. Thus

$$(2 - \lambda)Q(G, \lambda) = Q(G(e), \lambda) + (\lambda - 1)Q(G + u_1u_2, \lambda). \tag{4.6}$$

As $G \in \Phi_k$, we have $G(e) \in \Phi_{k+1}$. Since $\eta(\Phi_{k+1}) > \eta(\Phi_k)$ by assumption, we have $Q(G(e), \eta(\Phi_k)) > 0$. As $G+u_1u_2 \in \Psi_k$ and $\xi_k = \eta(\Phi_k)$, we have $Q(G+u_1u_2, \eta(\Phi_k)) \geq 0$. Hence $Q(G, \eta(\Phi_k)) > 0$, contradicting the assumption that $F(G, \eta(\Phi_k)) = 0$.

So Claim A holds. Now assume that for integer k with $k \geq 2$, $\eta(\Phi_0), \eta(\Phi_1), \eta(\Phi_2), \cdots, \eta(\Phi_k)$ is non-increasing and $\xi_i = \eta(\Phi_i)$ for $i = 0, 1, 2, \cdots, k$. By Claim A, $\eta(\Phi_{k+1}) \leq \eta(\Phi_k)$. Then, Lemma 4.2 implies that $\xi_{k+1} = \eta(\Phi_{k+1})$. Hence this theorem holds. □

Before the end of this section, we try to find the values of ξ_k (i.e., $\eta(\Phi_k)$) for some k. By Theorem 4.2 and the fact that $\Phi_{k+1} = \{G(e) : G \in \Phi_k, e \in E(G)\}$ for $k \geq 2$, it is not hard to find the value of ξ_k for small k. As an example, we will determine ξ_k for $0 \leq k \leq 5$.

Theorem 4.3 *$\xi_k = 2$ for $k = 0, 1, 2$, $\xi_3 = 1.430159709\cdots$, $\xi_4 = 1.361103081\cdots$, and $\xi_5 = 1.317672196\cdots$, where the last three numbers are the real roots of $\lambda^3-5\lambda^2+10\lambda-7$, $\lambda^3 - 4\lambda^2 + 8\lambda - 6$ and $\lambda^3 - 6\lambda^2 + 13\lambda - 9$ in $(1, 2)$ respectively.*

Proof. By Theorem 4.2, $\xi_k = \eta(\Phi_k)$. As Z_3 is the only graph of Φ_2, we have $\xi_2 = \eta(\Phi_2) = 2$. Thus $\xi_0 = \xi_1 = 2$. Note that the two graphs in Figure 5 are the only graphs of Φ_3 and Φ_4. Their flow polynomials are

$$(\lambda - 1)(\lambda^3 - 5\lambda^2 + 10\lambda - 7), \tag{4.7}$$

and

$$(\lambda - 1)(\lambda - 2)^2(\lambda^3 - 4\lambda^2 + 8\lambda - 6). \tag{4.8}$$

Each of the above polynomials has only one real root in $(1, 2)$:

$$1.430159709\cdots \quad \text{and} \quad 1.361103081\cdots. \tag{4.9}$$

Thus the result holds for ξ_3 and ξ_4. Because $\Phi = \Theta$, Φ_5 has only two different graphs, as shown in Figure 7.



(a) (b)

Figure 7: The only two graphs in Φ_5

Their flow polynomials are

$$(\lambda - 1)(\lambda^3 - 6\lambda^2 + 13\lambda - 9)(\lambda^4 - 5\lambda^3 + 12\lambda^2 - 16\lambda + 9), \tag{4.10}$$

$$(\lambda - 1)(\lambda - 2)(\lambda^6 - 9\lambda^5 + 37\lambda^4 - 89\lambda^3 + 132\lambda^2 - 112\lambda + 41). \tag{4.11}$$

Their smallest roots in $(1, 2)$ are $1.317672196\cdots$ and $1.335087886\cdots$ respectively. Thus the result holds. □

5 Integral Flow Roots

It is known that there exist graphs whose chromatic roots are all integers, for example, chordal graphs. There are also graphs which have all real chromatic roots but also

include non-integral chromatic roots. For any integer n with $n \geq 2$, let H_n be the graph obtained from the complete graph K_n by subdividing some edge in K_n once. Observe that

$$P(H_n, \lambda) = \lambda(\lambda - 1) \cdots (\lambda - n + 2)(\lambda^2 - n\lambda + 2n - 3). \tag{5.1}$$

When $n \geq 7$, all roots of $P(H_n, \lambda)$ are real, but some roots are not integral.

In this section we consider the problem of whether there is a graph whose flow roots also have similar properties, i.e., all flow roots are real but some of them are not integral. We shall show that if there is such a graph $G = (V, E)$, then this graph must satisfy various conditions (see Theorem 5.1)

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a bridgeless connected graph. If G has no 2-edge-cut, it can be proved by induction and by applying (2.1) that $F(G, \lambda)$ is a polynomial of order r, where $r = |E| - |V| + 1$, and if $F(G, \lambda) = \sum_{0 \leq i \leq r} b_i \lambda^i$, then

$$b_r = 1, b_{r-1} = -|E| \text{ and } b_{r-2} = \binom{|E|}{2} - \gamma, \tag{5.2}$$

where γ is the number of 3-edge-cuts of G. Applying the technique used in the proof of Lemma 4.2 in [6], a lower bound on γ in terms of $|E|$ and r can be obtained. We need to apply the following result whose proof can be found in [6].

Lemma 5.1 ([6]) *Assume that the polynomial*

$$P(\lambda) = \sum_{i=0}^{n} (-1)^i a_i \lambda^{n-i}, \tag{5.3}$$

where $a_0 = 1$, has only positive real roots. Then for each $i : 2 \leq i \leq n$,

$$0 < a_i \leq \binom{n}{i} \left(\frac{a_1}{n}\right)^i, \tag{5.4}$$

where equality holds if and only if $P(\lambda) = (\lambda - a_1/n)^n$.

Lemma 5.2 *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a bridgeless connected graph which has no 2-edge-cut. Assume that all roots of $F(G, \lambda)$ are real numbers. Let γ be the number of 3-edge-cuts of G. Then*

$$\gamma \geq \frac{(|E| - r)(|E| - 1)}{2(r - 1)}, \tag{5.5}$$

where the inequality is strict if $r - 1$ does not divide $|E| - 1$.

Proof. By Theorem 2.1, $F(G,\lambda)$ has a root 1. Write

$$F(G,\lambda) = (\lambda - 1)F_0(G,\lambda). \tag{5.6}$$

Let $1, -a_1$ and a_2 be the three leading coefficients of $F_0(G,\lambda)$. By (5.2),

$$a_1 + 1 = |E| \quad \text{and} \quad a_2 + a_1 = \binom{|E|}{2} - \gamma, \tag{5.7}$$

and so

$$\gamma = \binom{|E|}{2} - a_2 - (|E| - 1). \tag{5.8}$$

Since all roots of $F(G,\lambda)$ are real, by Theorem 2.1, all roots of $F(G,\lambda)$ are positive real numbers. Then, by Lemma 5.1, we have

$$a_2 \le \binom{r-1}{2}\left(\frac{|E|-1}{r-1}\right)^2, \tag{5.9}$$

where the equality holds if and only if $F_0(G,\lambda) = (\lambda - (|E|-1)/(r-1))^{r-1}$, which is impossible if $(|E|-1)/(r-1)$ is not an integer as every rational root of $F(G,\lambda)$ is integral. Hence (5.5) follows from (5.8) and (5.9). □

In Lemma 5.3 and Theorem 5.1 below, let $G = (V,E)$ be a non-separable graph in $\Psi_k \setminus \Psi_{k-1}$, where $k \ge 0$ and $\Psi_{-1} = \emptyset$, such that G has no 2-edge-cut nor proper 3-edge-cut.

Let v_i be the number of vertices of degree i in G, $r = |E| - |V| + 1$ and

$$\alpha = \sum_{i \ge 3}(i-3)v_i. \tag{5.10}$$

If $G \ne K_2$, then $\delta(G) \ge 3$ and so $\alpha = 2|E| - 3|V|$.

Lemma 5.3 *If $|V| \ge 3$, then the following results hold:*

(i) $r \ge \max\{3, 8k-6\}$ *and* $|V| \ge 2k$;

(ii) *if $k = 1$, then $\alpha \ge r - 2$; otherwise, $\alpha \ge r + 2k - 3$.*

Proof. As G is non-separable and has no 2-edge-cut, we have $v_i = 0$ for $i < 3$. Since $\alpha = 2|E| - 3|V|$ and $r = |E| - |V| + 1$, we can then deduce that $|V| = 2r - 2 - \alpha$ and $|E| = 3r - 3 - \alpha$.

As $|V| = 2r - \alpha - 2$, $\alpha \ge 0$ and $|V| \ge 3$, we have $r \ge 3$. Since G is non-separable, has no 2-edge-cut nor proper 3-edge-cut, we have $v_3 = \gamma$, where γ is the number of 3-edge-cuts of G. Thus Lemma 5.2 implies that

$$v_3 \ge \frac{(2r-3-\alpha)(3r-4-\alpha)}{2(r-1)}, \tag{5.11}$$

where the inequality is strict if $r-1$ does not divide $3r-4-\alpha$. Since $G \in \Psi_k \setminus \Psi_{k-1}$, we have $v_3 = |V| - k$ and so inequality (5.11) is equivalent to the following one:

$$2r - 2 - \alpha - k \geq \frac{(2r-3-\alpha)(3r-4-\alpha)}{2(r-1)}. \tag{5.12}$$

Inequality (5.12) is again equivalent to

$$(r-1)(r-8k+7) \geq (2\alpha - 3r + 5)^2. \tag{5.13}$$

We can show that $(r-1)(r-8k+7) > 0$. By (5.13), we need only consider the case that $2\alpha - 3r + 5 = 0$. So $3r - 4 - \alpha = 1.5(r-1)$, implying that inequalities (5.11), (5.12) and (5.13) are all strict and thus $(r-1)(r-8k+7) > 0$. As $r \geq 3$, $r \geq 8k-6$ and so $r \geq \max\{3, 8k-6\}$. Inequality (5.13) is equivalent to

$$(\alpha - r - 2k + 4)(\alpha - 2r + 2k + 1) + 4(k-1)^2 \leq 0. \tag{5.14}$$

Since $r + 2k - 4 \leq 2r - 2k - 1$, inequality (5.14) yields that $\alpha \geq r - 2$ if $k = 1$ and $\alpha \geq r + 2k - 3$ otherwise. As $|V| \geq 3$, it is clear that $|V| \geq 2k$ when $k \leq 1$. If $k \geq 2$, then inequality (5.14) implies that $\alpha \leq 2r - 2k - 2$ and so $|V| \geq 2k$ follows. □

For any bridgeless graph H, let $\mathcal{R}(H)$ be the multiset of real roots of $F(H, \lambda)$ in $(1, 2)$. Let

$$\omega(H) = \sum_{u \in \mathcal{R}(H)} (2 - u). \tag{5.15}$$

So $\omega(H) \geq 0$ where equality holds if and only if $\mathcal{R}(H) = \emptyset$. For any multiset A, let $|A| = \sum_{a \in A} n_a$, where n_a is the number of times that a appears in A. So $\omega(H) = 0$ if and only if $|A| = 0$, i.e., $\mathcal{R}(H) = \emptyset$. Now we are going to prove the main result of this section.

Theorem 5.1 *If $G \neq K_2$ and all flow roots of G are real, then one of the following statements holds:*

(i) *G is K_4;*

(ii) *every flow root of G is in the set $\{1, 2\}$; and*

(iii) *$k \geq 3$, $|V| \geq 2k$, $\omega(G) \geq |E| - 2|V| + 1 \geq 2k - 1$,*

$$|\mathcal{R}(G)| \geq (2k-1)/(2-\xi_k) \geq \begin{cases} 27k/11 + 12/11, & \text{if } 3 \leq k \leq 5, \\ 27k/11 - 27/22, & \text{if } k \geq 6; \end{cases}$$

and $\max\{|V| + 8k - 7, 2|V| + 2k - 2\} \leq |E| \leq ((|V|+1)\xi_k - 3)/(\xi_k - 1) < (32|V| - 49)/5$.

Proof. If $|V| = 1$, then G is the graph with one vertex and one loop, and so G has one root only (i.e., 1). Then consider the case that $|V| = 2$. G is the graph with two vertices and $|E|$ parallel edges joining these two vertices. Only when $|E| \leq 3$, all flow roots of G are real. As $G \neq K_2$, we have $2 \leq |E| \leq 3$ and thus (ii) holds.

Now assume that $|V| \geq 3$ and both (i) and (ii) are not true. We first prove two claims below before show that (iii) holds.

Claim 1: if $k = 0$, then $\alpha \geq r - 2$.

Suppose that $k = 0$ and $\alpha \leq r - 3$. Then Lemma 5.3 (ii) implies that $\alpha = r - 3$. However, as $G \in \Psi_0$, G is cubic by the given conditions and so $\alpha = 0$ and $|E| = \frac{3}{2}|V|$. Thus

$$3 = r = |E| - |V| + 1 = \frac{3}{2}|V| - |V| + 1,$$

implying that $|V| = 4$ and $|E| = 6$. Since G is non-separable and has no 2-edge-cut, G has no multiedges and so $G \cong K_4$, contradicting the assumption that (i) does not hold.

Claim 2: $k \geq 3$ and $\omega(G) \geq |E| - 2|V| + 1 \geq 2k - 1$, where the inequality is strict if $F(G, \lambda)$ has some real roots in $(2, \infty)$.

Let $t = |\mathcal{R}(G)|$, i.e., t is the number of real roots of $F(G, \lambda)$ in the interval $(1, 2)$, where the repeated roots are also counted. Since G is non-separable, $F(G, \lambda)$ has one root equal to 1 by Theorem 2.1. As all flow roots of G are real, Theorem 2.1 also implies that all roots of $F(G, \lambda)$ are in $[1, \infty)$. As $|E|$ is the sum of all flow roots of G and $F(G, \lambda)$ has exactly r roots, one of which is 1, exactly t of which are in $(1, 2)$ and $(r - t - 1)$ are at least 2, we have

$$|E| = 3r - \alpha - 3 \geq 1 + 2t - \omega(G) + 2(r - 1 - t) = 2r - 1 - \omega(G), \tag{5.16}$$

implying that $\omega(G) \geq \alpha + 2 - r = |E| - 2|V| + 1$, where the inequality is strict if $F(G, \lambda)$ has some real roots in $(2, \infty)$.

Assume that $k \leq 2$. Then $\mathcal{R}(G) = \emptyset$ by Theorem 4.2, and so $t = 0 = \omega(G)$. Since (ii) does not hold for G, $F(G, \lambda)$ has some roots in $(2, \infty)$, implying that (5.16) is strict and so $\alpha < r - 2$, contradicting Claim 1 and the result of Lemma 5.3 (ii).

As $k \geq 3$, Lemma 5.3 (ii) implies that $\alpha + 2 - r \geq 2k - 1$. So Claim 2 holds.

Now we are going to show that (iii) holds.

By Claim 2, it remains to show that the bounds for $|\mathcal{R}(G)|$ and $|E|$ in (iii) hold. Note that $\omega(G) \leq (2 - \xi_k)|\mathcal{R}(G)|$. By Claim 2, $\omega(G) \geq 2k - 1$ and so $|\mathcal{R}(G)| \geq (2k - 1)/(2 - \xi_k)$. It is known that $\xi_3 \geq 1.430$, $\xi_4 \geq 1.361$, $\xi_5 \geq 1.317$ and $\xi_k \geq 32/27$

for all $k \geq 5$. Thus we have

$$(2k-1)/(2-\xi_k) \geq \begin{cases} 27k/11 + 12/11, & \text{if } 3 \leq k \leq 5, \\ 27k/11 - 27/22, & \text{if } k \geq 6. \end{cases}$$

By Lemma 5.3 (i), we have $r \geq 8k-6$ and so $|E| \geq |V| + 8k - 7$. By Lemma 5.3 (ii), we have $\alpha \geq r + 2k - 3$ and so $|E| \geq 2|V| + 2k - 2$. Thus the lower bound for $|E|$ in (iii) holds.

Since $|V| \geq 2k$ by Lemma 5.3, G has at least $k \geq 3$ vertices of degree 3 and thus 2 is its flow root[6]. As $F(G, \lambda)$ is a polynomial of order r, we have $|\mathcal{R}(G)| \leq r - 2$. Thus

$$|E| - |V| - 1 = r - 2 \geq |\mathcal{R}(G)|. \tag{5.17}$$

On the other hand,

$$|\mathcal{R}(G)|(2-\xi_k) \geq \omega(G) \geq |E| - 2|V| + 1, \tag{5.18}$$

where the last inequality is from Claim 2. So we have

$$(|E| - |V| - 1)(2-\xi_k) \geq |E| - 2|V| + 1. \tag{5.19}$$

Then it follows that

$$|E| \leq \frac{(|V|+1)\xi_k - 3}{\xi_k - 1} < \frac{32|V| - 49}{5}, \tag{5.20}$$

where the last inequality follows from the fact that $\xi_k > 32/27$. □

By Theorem 5.1, if $|\mathcal{R}(G)| \leq 8$ or $|E| \leq |V| + 16$, then each flow root of G is contained in $\{1, 2, 3\}$. In fact, for such a result, the condition that G has no 2-edge-cut nor proper 3-edge-cut is not necessary.

Theorem 5.2 *Let $G = (V, E)$ be any bridgeless graph. Assume that all roots of $F(G, \lambda)$ are real. If either $|E| \leq |V| + 16$ or $|\mathcal{R}(G)| \leq 8$, then every root of $F(G, \lambda)$ is in $\{1, 2, 3\}$.*

Proof. Note that if $|E| \leq |V| + 16$, then $|E(B)| \leq |V(B)| + 16$ for every block B of G; and if $|\mathcal{R}(G)| \leq 8$, then $|\mathcal{R}(B)| \leq 8$ for each block B of G. Thus we need only to prove the result for all non-separable graphs.

Let $\mathcal{Z}$ be the set of non-separable bridgeless graphs G such that all roots of $F(G, \lambda)$ are real, and either $|E| \leq |V| + 16$ or $|\mathcal{R}(G)| \leq 8$. Suppose that there is a graph $G \in \mathcal{Z}$ such that some flow root of G is not in $\{1, 2, 3\}$. We may assume that $|V|$ has the

[6]It is known that 2 is a flow root of G if and only if G has at least one vertex of odd degree, because G has a nowhere-zero $\mathbb{Z}_2$-flow if and only if every vertex of G has even degree.

minimum value among all such graphs and that $G \in \Psi_k \setminus \Psi_{k-1}$. We shall complete the proof by showing the following claims.

Claim 1: G contains a 2-edge-cut or a proper 3-edge-cut.

Suppose that the claim is wrong. By the assumption on the minimality of $|V|$, $\delta(G) \geq 3$. Then Theorem 5.1 implies that $k \geq 3$, $|\mathcal{R}(G)| \geq 9$ and $|E| \geq |V| + 8k - 8$, contradicting the given condition. Hence the claim holds.

Claim 2: all flow roots of G are in $\{1, 2, 3\}$, contradicting the assumption on G.

By Claim 1, G contains a 2-edge-cut or a proper 3-edge-cut. Let S be such an edge-cut. By Lemma 2.3 or 2.4,

$$F(G, \lambda) = \frac{F(G_1, \lambda)F(G_2, \lambda)}{\lambda - 1} \quad \text{or} \quad F(G, \lambda) = \frac{F(G_1, \lambda)F(G_2, \lambda)}{(\lambda - 1)(\lambda - 2)}, \tag{5.21}$$

where G_1 and G_2 are the graphs stated in Lemma 2.3 or 2.4. By (5.21), as G has real flow roots only, G_i has real flow roots only for $i = 1, 2$; if $|\mathcal{R}(G)| \leq 8$, then $|\mathcal{R}(G_i)| \leq 8$ for $i = 1, 2$.

It is obvious that G_1 is non-separable, and $|E(G_1)| - |V(G_1)| \leq |E(G)| - |V(G)|$. Thus, if $|E| \leq |V| + 16$, then $|E(G_1)| \leq |V(G_1)| + 16$. Hence $G_1 \in \mathcal{Z}$ and similarly $G_2 \in \mathcal{Z}$.

It is clear that $|V(G_i)| < |V|$ for $i = 1, 2$. By the assumption on G, every flow root of G_i is contained in $\{1, 2, 3\}$ for $i = 1, 2$. Hence (5.21) implies that every flow roots of G is contained in $\{1, 2, 3\}$.

Therefore claim 2 is true and the result holds. □

Recently, Kung and Royle [6] proved a very interesting result.

Theorem 5.3 (Kung and Royle [6]) *If G is a bridgeless graph, then its flow roots are integral if and only if G is the dual of a planar chordal graph.*

By Theorems 5.2 and 5.3, we immediately obtain the following result.

Corollary 5.1 *Let $G = (V, E)$ be any bridgeless graph which has only real flow roots. If G is not the dual of a planar chordal graph, then $|E| \geq |V| + 17$ and $|\mathcal{R}(G)| \geq 9$, i.e., G has at least 9 flow roots in $(1, 2)$.* □

Corollary 5.2 *For a connected planar graph $G = (V, E)$, if G has real chromatic roots only and G is not chordal, then $|V| \geq 19$ and G has at least 9 chromatic roots in $(1, 2)$ (counting multiplicity for each root).*

Proof. We have $P(G,\lambda) = \lambda F(G^*,\lambda)$. As G is not chordal, by Theorem 5.3, G^* has some non-integral real flow roots. By Corollary 5.1, $|E(G^*)| \geq |V(G^*)|+17$ and G^* has at least 9 flow roots in $(1,2)$, where the latter implies that G has at least 9 chromatic roots in $(1,2)$. Notice that

$$|E(G^*)| = |E(G)| \quad \text{and} \quad |V(G^*)| = |E(G)| - |V(G)| + 2,$$

thus $|E(G^*)| \geq |V(G^*)| + 17$ implies that $|V(G)| \geq 19$. □

We would like to propose the following conjecture to end this article.

Conjecture 5.1 *For any bridgeless graph G, if all flow roots of G are real, then all flow roots of G are contained in $\{1,2,3\}$.*

Let $\mathcal{L}$ be the family of non-separable graphs which have no 2-edge-cut nor 3-edge-cut. Lemmas 2.1, 2.3 and 2.4 imply that Conjecture 5.1 holds if and only if it holds for all graphs in $\mathcal{L}$. If Conjecture 5.1 does not hold for some graph $G \in \mathcal{L}$, then Theorem 5.1 implies that G has at least $27k/11 - 27/22$ flow roots in $(1,2)$, where $k = |W(G)| \geq 3$. This is a reason why this conjecture is proposed.

Acknowledgement. The author wishes to thank the referees for their very helpful comments and suggestions.

References

[1] G.D. Birkhoff and D.C. Lewis, Chromatic polynomials, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **60** (1946), 355-451.

[2] B. Jackson, A zero-free interval for chromatic polynomials of graphs, *Combin. Probab. Comput.* **2**(1993), 325-336.

[3] B. Jackson, Zeros of chromatic and flow polynomials of graphs, *J. Geom.* **76** (2003), no. 1-2, 95-109, Combinatorics, 2002 (Maratea). MR MR2005532 (2004h:05048)

[4] B. Jackson, A zero-free interval for flow polynomials of near-cubic graphs, *Combin. Probab. Comput.* **16** (2007), no. 1, 85-108.

[5] B. Jackson, A zero-free interval for flow polynomials of cubic graphs. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* **97** (2007), 127-143.

[6] J.P.S. Kung and G. Royle, Graphs whose flow polynomials have only integral roots, *European Journal of Combinatorics* **32** (2011), 831-840.

[7] Wakelin, C. D., *Chromatic Polynomials*, Ph.D. Thesis, University of Nottingham, 1994.

[8] E.G. Whitehead Jr. and L.C. Zhao, Cutpoints and the chromatic polynomial, *J. Graph Theory* **8** (1984), 371-377.

[9] D.R. Woodall, Zeros of chromatic polynomials, in *Combinatorial Survey, Proc. Sixth British Combin. Conf.* (ed. P.J. Cameron), Academic Press (1977), 199-223.

[10] W.T. Tutte, Graph Theory, *Addison-Welsey, Reading, Mass.*, 1984.